



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,598	10/28/2005	Sylvain Dumet	PF020122	8266
24498	7590	04/09/2009		
Thomson Licensing LLC			EXAMINER	
P.O. Box 5312			LEE, ANDREW CHUNG CHEUNG	
Two Independence Way				
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2419	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/528,598

Applicant(s)

DUMET ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew C. Lee

Art Unit

2419

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/26/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1 – 10 are pending.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 6, 8 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding claims 6, 8, the amendment does not fully comply with the requirement of 37 CFR 1.111(b). The amended subject matter is not underlined.

Regarding claim 6, the amended clause “a means for” should be underlined for indicating the change. Regarding claim 8, the amended word “including” should be underlined for indicating the change.

Regarding claim 8, the amended clause “a comprises means for” does not make a complete sentence as a whole — wherein the switch further a comprises means for including? The whole sentence is not clear. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding clai

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1 – 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mahajan et al. (US 6735201 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Mahajan et al. disclose method for routing data packets in a routing device connecting a first network and a second network (*Fig. 2, col. 8, lines 15 – 24, 44 – 52*), the steps of: (a) receiving a frame from a device connected to the first network (*"Ethernet frame"; col. 8, lines 61 – 66*); (b) forwarding the frame to an internal bridge function of the routing device (*Fig. 4, element 408, Bridge Forwarding Engine*); wherein the bridge function is preformed by a means for forwarding a frame based on a destination address of the frame (*"forwards the packet through the switch using conventional bridge forwarding techniques based upon the MAC destination address contained in the MAC header of the message packet"; col. 5, lines 21 – 24*); (c) checking whether the frame contains a multicast group management message (*"determine from the IP protocol information 540 whether the message packet 500 is an IGMP message"; col. 9, lines 65 – 67*) and in the affirmative, creating a new frame comprising as destination address the destination address of an internal multicast group management module and as payload at least the multicast management data of the received frame (*col. 10, lines 1 – 21*); and (d) forwarding this new frame to the internal bridge function (*col. 10, lines 45 – 57*).

Regarding claim 2, Mahajan et al. disclose method according to claimed wherein the first network is an Ethernet network and wherein the steps (a) to (d) are carried out by an Ethernet switch module (*col. 8, lines 61 – 67*).

Regarding claim 3, Mahajan et al. disclose method according to claimed further comprising the step of inserting into the new frame an identifier of a port on which the initial frame was received (*"associated with forwarding index values which identify the port or ports"; col. 9, lines 39 – 55*).

Regarding claims 4, 9, Mahajan et al. disclose method and routing device according to claimed wherein the multicast group management message is an IGMP message (*"a specific protocol type of multicast messages (e. g., IGMP)"; col. 5, lines 9 – 12*).

Regarding claim 5, Mahajan et al. disclose method according to claimed further comprising the step, by the multicast group management module upon reception of the new frame, of updating its multicast group information (*"update the switch's forwarding table"; col. 6, lines 52 – 61*).

Regarding claims 6, 10, Mahajan et al. disclose routing device for connecting a first and a second network (*"element 300 switch" interpreted as routing device; Fig. 2, col. 8, lines 15 – 24, 44 – 52*), said device comprising: (a) a switch for receiving frames from the first network (*"Ethernet frame"; col. 8, lines 61 – 66, "element 402 packet Parsing engine" col. 9, lines 29 – 38*); (b) an internal bridge function for delivering frames to appropriate modules as a function of respective frame destination addresses, said bridge function being connected to the switch (*Fig. 4, element 408, Bridge Forwarding Engine; col. 9, lines 39 – 48*); (c) a multicast group management module for maintaining up to date multicast group information based on frames received on the first network, said multicast group management module being connected to the bridge

function for receiving selected frames there from (*"update the switch's forwarding table"; Fig. 3, col. 6, lines 52 – 61*); wherein the switch is a means for determining whether a received frame comprises a multicast group management message (*"determine from the IP protocol information 540 whether the message packet 500 is an IGMP message"; col. 9, lines 65 – 67*), and in the affirmative, providing a new frame comprising multicast group management information extracted from the original received frame, wherein the new frame has a destination address equal to the address of an internal multicast group management module (*col. 10, lines 1 – 44, col. 11, lines 43 – 67*), and for forwarding the new frame to the bridge function (*col. 10, lines 45 – 57*).

Regarding claim 7, Mahajan et al. disclose routing device according to claimed wherein the switch is an Ethernet switch (*"packets sent or received from the switch are Ethernet frames"; col. 8, lines 61 – 67*).

Regarding claim 8, Mahajan et al. disclose routing device according to claimed wherein the switch comprises a plurality of ports for receiving frames (*"the switch is 3-port bridge comprising Port A, port B, and Port R"; col. 8, lines 44 – 56*), and wherein the switch further comprises means for including into the new frame a port identifier of the port on which the initial frame containing the multicast group management message arrived (*"associated with forwarding index values which identify the port or ports"; col. 9, lines 39 – 55*).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 01/25/2009 with respect to claims 1 – 10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, applicant argues neither of these conditions (in reference Mahajan et al.) is the same as “creating a frame” or additional steps of Claims 1. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner contends reference Mahajan et al. teaches implicitly and explicitly creating a frame. Examiner interpreted creating a frame implicitly as “generates and supplies signals to”, see col. 10, lines 21 - 61, while explicitly “creates such an entry in the table....”, see col. 11, lines 43 – 67.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a) Ooghe et al. (US 20030123453 A1).
- b) Kobayashi (US 6457059 B1).
- c) Merchant (US 6778547 B1).

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew C. Lee whose telephone number is (571)272-3131. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on (571) 272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew C Lee/
Examiner, Art Unit 2419
<4/05/2009::3Qy09>

/Ronald Abelson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2419